



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/759,605

01/20/2004

Jan Weber

12013/51401

8100

23838 7590 01/05/2010

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
1500 K STREET N.W.  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3738

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/05/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/759,605	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WEBER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Brian E. Pellegrino	<b>Art Unit</b> 3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-33 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6, 8, 12, 14-20, 23 and 24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 21, 22, 25-33 and 36-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/15/09 has been entered.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(b) because they are incomplete. 37 CFR 1.83(b) reads as follows:

When the invention consists of an improvement on an old machine the drawing must when possible exhibit, in one or more views, the improved portion itself, disconnected from the old structure, and also in another view, so much only of the old structure as will suffice to show the connection of the invention therewith.

Applicant contends the claimed invention is shown in the informal drawing Fig. 1. First the drawings are not clear illustrations because of the poor quality. Second the entire implant being covered in a continuous manner as claimed must be shown, not a brief, incomplete illustration of the invention. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is

Art Unit: 3738

being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the limitation that the implant body is covered by a continuous filter layer was not found in the written description.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 25 recites the filter layer is not cover portions of the stent where there is high strain. This appears to contradict claim 1 from which it depends since the independent claim recites the filter layer is continuous to cover the body. Therefore, how can there be regions not covered when it first states the body is continuously covered?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5,7,9,10,13,25-27,29,30,36-38,40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt (2004/0039438) in view of Narhi et al. (7527804) and Hehrlein et al. (EP 1319416). Fig. 2 shows an implant body **30** having a first surface covered with a catalyst of metal material **32**, paragraph 32. Coeckelberghs et al. (4752461) teach (col. 5, lines 41-53) that metal ions act as a catalyst to promote the decomposition of hydrogen peroxide to hydrogen and oxygen. Thus, the metal material of Alt is fully capable of being a catalyst as claimed. It can also be seen (Fig. 2) that the catalyst layer of material is covered with a “filter” layer **40** on the porous material **33** and the implant. Alt discloses (paragraph 38) the filter layer has “pores” and since the porous layer it covers has dimensions or pore sizes (paragraph 31) of a microporous

Art Unit: 3738

size, it retards white and red blood cells. It is noted that Alt discloses that the filter layer has dimensions of a thickness of 10-50nm, paragraph 37. Regarding claim 7, the catalyst comprises a therapeutic **43**. With respect to claim 26, Alt discloses the catalyst metal can be platinum and can be previously treated, paragraph 32. Regarding claim 30, Alt discloses the base layer is a non-polymer, paragraph 31. However, Alt does not explicitly state the pore size of the filter layer or more specifically 2-50nm. Since the claimed filter layer are pore sizes that fall within dimensions of the thickness of the filter layer of Alt, it would be plausible that the pores of the filter layer of Alt have dimensions as claimed. Narhi et al. teach (col. 5, lines 4-7,44,45,50) that a coated stent can have pore diameters 2-50nm in the porous coating. Narhi et al. further teach that the dimensions of the porous layer enhance the attachment of the layer to the tissue, but prevents encapsulation, which would lead to restenosis, col. 5, lines 21-27. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the dimensions of the pores in the filter layer of Alt to have dimensions of 2-50nm as taught by Narhi et al. since it would improve the stabilization of the stent within the vessel and prevent narrowing of the vessel. Alt is silent with respect to a continuous filter layer. However, Hehrlein et al. teach the use of a continuous filter layer on the stent, paragraph 6. Hehrlein et al. also teach that the ceramic coating or filter layer improves the integrity of the stent, paragraph 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a continuous ceramic filter layer as taught by Hehrlein et al. with the stent of Alt as modified with Narhi et al. such that it provides a suitable device that does not cause irritation, but is more stable in the lumen of the patient, Hehrlein. With respect to claims

Art Unit: 3738

4,5,25 Alt does not explicitly recite to cover the entire surface of the implant with the catalyst and filter or that regions of high strain when the stent is expanded are not covered. Because the interstices of the outer layers on the stent are used for therapeutic material, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to cover the entire surface with the catalyst and filter material such that it holds more drug material, thus producing predictable results of being able to deliver more therapeutic material to the treatment site. With respect to claim 25 and its limitation of the covering on low strain regions when expanded and not high strain, it is common sense that the more material on an object that is expanding has to exert more force and thus more strain results in that area or region. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use less filter material over the high strain regions such that it does not compromise the stent device. Such a modification provides predictable results. Regarding claim 10, Alt does not explicitly recite the porous material is titanium oxide. Narhi et al. '804 teach that one can use titanium oxide coating to enhance tissue acceptance of an implant, col. 5, lines 1-4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute porous oxide materials and use titanium oxide as taught by Narhi et al. '804 with the stent of Alt '39438 since such a modification only involves routine skill and yields predictable results. With respect to claim 29, Alt does not explicitly state the implant material is a polymer, Narhi et al. teach that alternatively polymers can be substituted for metal implant materials, col. 5, lines 8,9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute implant materials and use a polymer as taught by Narhi et al. with the stent of Alt since the material could

Art Unit: 3738

significantly reduce costs. Additionally, the material could also be substituted to provide a less radiopaque implant that does have interference when using MRI. Regarding claims 41-43 the ceramic coating is Alt's stent is a titanium oxide and Hehrlein also teaches to coat with an alternative oxide, paragraph 4. It is noted that coatings containing titanium can be used on the stent of Alt. Alt can be said to disclose the catalyst is iridium and its oxide is placed on the outer exposed surface. Hehrlein discloses the outer surface is coated with titanium oxide. It would have been an obvious expedient to use alternative oxides and use the teaching of Hehrlein that titanium oxide can be applied to stents and thus use it as the catalyst for the stent of Alt.

Claims 21,22,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt (2004/0039438) in view of Narhi et al. '804 and Hehrlein as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Smalley et al. (2002/85968). Alt in view of Narhi is explained supra. Alt does disclose the filter material can comprise iridium oxide, paragraph 37. However, Alt fails to disclose alternative filter material or coverings for the composite stent. Smalley et al. teach the use of catalysts with carbon nanotubes or bucky paper coated onto to composites including implants and prostheses, paragraphs 121,276. Smalley also teaches that the bucky paper is useful in supporting catalysts on devices (paragraph 126) and to provide a composite device resisting delamination, paragraph 14. Smalley additionally teaches the bucky paper can be used with oxides, paragraphs 94,166,268. Smalley also teaches that polymers can be applied to enclose the composite material and provide the bulk or support for the body framework, paragraphs 257,259. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to



Art Unit: 3738

incorporate bucky paper and a polymer matrix as taught by Smalley et al. with the stent of Alt as modified with Narhi and Hehrlein et al. such that it improves the adherence of the layers formed on the stent material and provide a supportive device that will not collapse or degrade.

Claims 31-33,39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trozera (6475233) in view of Alt et al. (2004/0039438) and Tarhi et al. '804 and Hehrlein et al. (EP 1319416). Trozera shows (Figs. 6a-8c) different strut patterns for stents having a tapered cross-section relative to the longitudinal axis of the stent. Trozera also discloses the stent is expandable, col. 9, lines 26,30. However, Trozera fails to disclose the use of a catalyst and filter layer with pore diameters of 2-50nm. Alt is explained supra. Tarhi et al. is also explained above. Hehrlein et al. is also explained supra. Alt discloses the outer coating layer or oxide aids in reducing inflammation, col. 10, lines 41-47. Tarhi also teaches that the porous coating enhances tissue acceptance and reduces the likelihood of restenosis, col. 5, lines 4-7,21-27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the catalyst and continuous filter material as taught by Hehrlein et al. on the stent as taught by Alt and use pore sizes of 2-50 nm as taught by Narhi et al. such that the stent of Trozera can provide a limited inflammatory response when implanted.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian E. Pellegrino whose telephone number is 571-272-4756. The examiner can normally be reached on M- F (7am-5:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TC 3700  
/Brian E Pellegrino/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3738